



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/613,426	07/03/2003	Vikram Devdas	CISCP816	5113
26541	7590	09/28/2004	EXAMINER	
RITTER, LANG & KAPLAN 12930 SARATOGA AE. SUITE D1 SARATOGA, CA 95070			TSEGAYE, SABA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2662	

DATE MAILED: 09/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/613,426

Applicant(s)

DEVDA ET AL.

Examiner

Saba Tsegaye

Art Unit

2662

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 06/24/04, 06/07/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Objections***

1. Claim 4 is objected to because of the following informalities: in line 3, there appears to be a typographical error. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 12-14 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 12, line 5, it is not clear whether the phrase "an identification tag" refers to the same an identification tag cited in line 2.

Claim 21, line 6, it is not clear whether the phrase "an identification tag" refers to the same an identification tag cited in line 2.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2662

5. Claims 1-4, 8-11 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. (US 2003/0074449) in view of Ghose et al. (US 2002/0004842).

Regarding claims 1, 8 and 17, Smith discloses, in Figs 3-5, a method for efficiently transmitting GFP-encapsulated client data frames from a local transport interface (NE1) and at least one local port (CX) associated therewith across a SONET/SDH transport network (120) to a remote transport interface (NE2) and at least one remote port (XC) associated therewith, the remote transport interface (NE2) having a buffer (226) for holding the GFP-encapsulated client data frames received across the SONET/SDH transport network (120).

Further, Smith discloses a buffer-to buffer flow control that regulates traffic along a link between the transmitter port and the receiver port by controlling the rate at which the transmitter can send data to the receiver (claimed receiving information from the remote transport interface). The transmitter is able to transmit a frame along a link only if the receiver has indicated it can accept the frame. The receiving port controls the transmission of frames by giving permission to the sending port to send one or more frame to that particular receiving port (claimed transmitting more GFP client data frames responsive to the information). Each port keeps track of the buffer credit count, which is initialized to zero. For each frame transmitted, the credit count is incremented by one, and for each frame received, the credit count is decreased (claimed tracking the number of GFP-encapsulated client data frames).

However, Smith does not disclose a flow control based on the number of bytes available in the remote transport interface buffer.

Ghose teaches buffer-to-buffer credits for implementing flow control based on the number of bytes received successfully (page 4, 0055-0057) and tracking the number of bytes of

Art Unit: 2662

GFP-encapsulated client data frames in transit from the local transport interface to the remote transport interface (0057-0062).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the teaching from Ghose of a flow control based on the number of bytes to the frame based protocol networks disclosed by Smith. One would be motivated to do this because a flow control based on bytes would greatly improved end-to-end latency and implement reliable delivery (0054).

Regarding claims 2, 3, 9, 10, 18 and 19, Smith discloses the method wherein the client data comprises Fiber Channel signals and gigabit Ethernet signals (page 2, 0033-0035).

Regarding claims 4, 11 and 20, Smith discloses the method wherein the receiving step further comprises: initially negotiating with the remote transport interface for the total amount of space in the buffer reserved for GFP-encapsulated client data frames received from the local transport interface (page 8, 0144-0156).

6. Claims 5-7, 12-16 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. in view of Ghose et al. as applied to claims 1, 8 and 17 above, and further in view of Tate et al. (US 2003/0185223).

Smith in view of Ghose discloses all the claim limitations as stated above. Further, Smith discloses a frame oriented client signal such as a Fiber Channel or Ethernet signal. According to the IEEE standard 802.1Q Ethernet frames are tagged. However, Smith does not expressly

Art Unit: 2662

disclose sending/receiving an identification tag for each of the GFP-encapsulated client data frames.

Tate teaches a GFP encapsulation scheme to a provider device being arranged for exchanging tagged frames with a bridge having at least two Ethernet interfaces (0031-0037).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the teaching from Tate of exchanging tagged frames to the system disclosed by Smith in view of Ghose. One would have been motivated to do this because it allows a particular Ethernet interface to be informed of a failure on a corresponding service unit port (0029).

### ***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Miller et al. (US 2004/0085902) discloses a method and system for extending the reach of a data communication channel using a flow control interception device.

Kamiya (US 2003/0112833) discloses a method and apparatus for transmitting and receiving multiple signals.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Saba Tsegaye whose telephone number is (571) 272-3091. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (7:30-5:00), First Friday off.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Kizou can be reached on (571) 272-3088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2662

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ST

September 23, 2004



**JOHN PEZZLO**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**